

Announcement

The Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) will accept proposals for assessments and studies that span two or more lead entity geographic areas. Proposals must be post marked no later than October 8, 2004 and will be acted on by the SRFB at its December 2-3, 2004 meeting.

Background

Assessments spanning multiple lead entity areas rarely come to the SRFB through the lead entity process, often because lead entities tend to only prioritize projects within their lead entity area and that affect fish spawning in their area. However, a salmon's range may span several lead entity areas. For example, salmon spawning in the Wenatchee watershed will swim through several lead entity areas as they travel the Columbia River mainstem. Likewise, salmon spawning in the Nisqually basin might swim through the marine and estuarine portions of many lead entity areas as they make their way to and from the Pacific Ocean.

In marine nearshore areas, the ecosystems in different lead entity areas can be highly interconnected, and thus ecological processes are likely to span multiple lead entity areas. This means that assessments may need to be conducted over larger areas to provide useful results. In addition, some types of assessments can offer significant efficiencies in time and costs if conducted over a number of lead entity areas as part of the same project.

Eligible Projects

Proposed assessments must include portions of two or more lead entity areas. The results of any assessment must directly and clearly lead to identification, siting, or design of salmon habitat protection or restoration projects or fill a data gap that is identified as a priority in a lead entity strategy and is limiting project or strategy development. Assessments only intended for research purposes, stand-alone monitoring, or to further general knowledge and understanding of watershed or marine nearshore conditions, processes and functions, although important, are not eligible for this request for proposals.

Assessments must be closely coordinated with other similar assessments and data collection efforts undertaken by federal, tribal, state, regional, and local organizations to prevent duplication and ensure the use of appropriate methods and protocols. Assessments and studies must be completed within two years unless additional time is necessary and can be justified by the project sponsor.

To the extent feasible, the concepts and approaches outlined in Guidance for Watershed Assessment for Salmon (Joint Natural Resources Cabinet, 2001) should be used to identify and support the need for the assessment and provide guidance for the design and implementation of the assessment. Applicants are asked to describe how their proposed assessment addresses the stages and elements in the Guidance document. It can be found at: <http://www.governor.wa.gov/gсро/publications.htm>.

For marine nearshore assessments, the SRFB urges that applicants use the technical resources identified by the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration (PSNER) Science Team: Guidance for Evaluating SRFB Nearshore Assessments (2002) and, for Puget Sound marine nearshore projects, Guidance for Protection and Restoration of the Nearshore Ecosystems of the Puget Sound (Nearshore Science Team, 2003).

Match

A minimum match of 15 percent is required by the applicant. Projects with a greater match will receive a higher priority in the SRFB evaluation process.

Matching resources can include cash, bonds, local and other state or federal grants (unless prohibited by funding source), donated labor, equipment, or materials and force account. All matching resources must be an integral and necessary part of the approved project, must be eligible SRFB elements and items for the project, and must be committed to the project. SRFB's policies regarding valuation of donations are in Appendix C of Manual #18b – Application Instructions.

Eligible Applicants

- Cities
- Native American Tribes
- Non Profit Organizations
- Special Purpose Districts
- Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups
- Counties
- Conservation Districts
- Colleges and Universities
- State Agencies

Non-profit organizations must be registered with the Office of the Washington Secretary of State to be eligible. A non-profit's charter, organizational documents or corporate purposes must include authority for the protection or enhancement of natural resources such as salmon, salmon habitat, or related recovery activities. The charter must also include provisions for identification of an equivalent successor under the SRFB grant agreement, in case the non-profit disbands for any reason. (Note: dissolution provisions are required of all non-profit corporations under state law.)

Federal agencies are not eligible to be direct applicants but may be a partner with an eligible sponsor. Note that federal restrictions on using certain types of funds for match

will need to be taken into consideration, depending on the federal agency's role with the SRFB grants.

A landowner agreement is required for proposals on land not owned or controlled by the project sponsor. The Application Instructions include forms and materials for Landowner Agreement requirements. Applicants are required to enter their information using PRISM and Manual 18i (non-capital projects). Applicants should attach any photos, maps, reports, and other documents that help explain the project.

Content of Proposal

The proposal should:

1. Identify the species of salmon that be will be addressed and, if possible, their watershed of origin.
2. Provide statements of support from lead entities representing areas where the assessment is being conducted, and other lead entities when appropriate. The statement of support should include the degree of support and a statement regarding how the assessment addresses priorities identified in the lead entity's strategy and/or would help fill important data gaps.
3. Demonstrate how the results of the assessment would lead to the improvement of lead entity strategies and/or lead directly to restoration and protection projects.
4. Identify geographic scope, noting all lead entity areas included in the proposed assessment.
5. Demonstrate why the assessment should be done across multiple lead entities areas rather be submitted through one or more individual lead entities as part of the annual funding cycle.
6. Demonstrate how the assessment addresses priorities in relevant lead entity strategies, or if not, why not.
7. Describe methodology and demonstrate the use of standard protocols.
8. Demonstrate coordination with similar assessments when appropriate.

Due Date of Proposals

Proposals must be postmarked no later than October 8, 2004.

Evaluation and Award Process

Proposals will be reviewed by IAC/SRFB staff for completeness and forwarded to the SRFB Review Panel for evaluation. The Review Panel, with the assistance of its technical advisors, will evaluate the proposals. Applicants may be asked to make an in-

person presentation of their proposal to the Review Panel in early November 2004, after which the Panel will rate and rank the proposals statewide. Applicants will have an opportunity to respond to the draft Review Panel Report. The final Review Panel report will be circulated for comment prior to the December 2-3, 2004 SRFB meeting.

Evaluation Criteria

The Review Panel and its technical advisors will evaluate and rank proposals based on the following criteria:

- Amount of match greater than the minimum of 15 percent
- Level of support by the affected or cooperating lead entities
- Rationale for a multi-lead entity areas approach
- Coordination with similar assessments and data collection efforts undertaken by federal, tribal, state, regional, and local organizations to prevent duplication and ensure the use of appropriate methods and protocols
- How well the assessment addresses priorities and identified data gaps in relevant lead entity strategies
- Benefits to salmon and certainty of success (Attachment I)

For Additional Information

For questions, application forms, or instructions on how to apply on line contact Tammy Owings at 360-902-2637.

Proposal packets, post marked no later than October 8, 2004, should be sent to:

Tammy Owings
SRFB
1111 Washington Street SE
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98557

Attachment I: Evaluating Benefits and Certainty

Benefits of an Assessment Project

	High Benefit Project
Watershed Processes & Habitat Features	Addresses high priority habitat features and/or watershed process that significantly protects or limits the salmonid productivity in the area. Crucial to understanding watershed processes, is directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will clearly lead to new projects in high priority areas.
Areas & Actions	Is a high priority action located in a high priority geographic area. Fills an important data gap in a high priority area.
Species	Addresses multiple species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or ESA-listed fish species or non-listed populations primarily supported by natural spawning. Fish use has been documented.
Life History	Addresses an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of the salmonid species in the area and/or project addresses multiple life history requirements.
Costs	Has a low cost relative to the predicted benefits.

	Medium Benefit Project
Watershed Processes & Habitat Features	May not address the most important limiting factor but will lead to improved habitat conditions. Will lead to new projects in moderate priority areas and is independent of other key conditions being addressed first.
Areas & Actions	May be an important action but in a moderate priority geographic area. Fills an important data gap, but is in a moderate priority area.
Species	Addresses a moderate number of species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or ESA-listed fish species or non-listed populations primarily supported by natural spawning. Fish use has been documented.
Life History	Addresses fewer life history stages or habitat types that limits the productivity of the salmonid species in the area and/or partially addresses fewer life history requirements.
Costs	Has a reasonable cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location.

	Low Benefit Project
Watershed Processes & Habitat Features	Has not been proven to address an important habitat condition in the area.
Areas & Actions	Addresses a lower priority action or geographic area.
Species	Addresses a single species of a lower priority. Fish use may not have been documented.
Life History	Is unclear about the salmonid life history being addressed.
Costs	Has a high cost relative to the predicted benefits for that particular project type in that location.

Certainty of an Assessment Project

	High Certainty Project
Appropriate	Scope is appropriate to meet its goals and objectives.
Approach	Is consistent with proven scientific methods. Methodology will effectively address an information/data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within one-to-two years of completion.
Sequence	Is in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions being taken first.
Threat	Addresses a high potential threat to salmonid habitat.
Landowner	Landowners are willing to have work done.
Implementation	Actions are scheduled, funded, and ready to take place and have few or no known constraints to successful implementation as well as other projects that may result from this project.

	Medium Certainty Project
Appropriate	Is moderately appropriate to meet its goals and objectives.
Approach	Uses scientific methods that may have been tested but the results are incomplete. Methods will effectively address an information/data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within three-to-five years of completion.
Sequence	Is dependent on other actions being taken first that are outside the scope of this project.
Threat	Addresses a moderate potential threat to salmonid habitat.
Landowner	Landowners may have been contacted and are likely to allow work to be done.
Implementation	Has few or no known constraints to successful implementation as well as other projects that may result from this project.

	Low Certainty Project
Appropriate	The methodology does not appear to meet the goals and objectives of the project.
Approach	Uses methods that have not been tested or proven to be effective in past uses.
Sequence	May be in the wrong sequence with other protection and restoration actions.
Threat	Addresses a low potential for a threat to salmonid habitat.
Landowner	Landowner willingness is unknown.
Implementation	Actions are unscheduled, unfunded, and not ready to take place and has several constraints to successful implementation.